Information Services Board Meeting Minutes – March 18, 2003
Department of Information Services Boardroom, The Forum Building
Olympia, Washington

Members Present:
Glenn Anderson
Emilio Cantu
Marty Daybell
Darlene Fairley
Tom Fitzsimmons
Earl Heister
Ed Lazowska (by telephone)
D.J. Mark
Stuart McKee
Mary McQueen
Gary Robinson
Laura Ruderman
Fred Stephens

Members Absent:
Jayasri Guha

Roll Call	A sufficient number of members were present to constitute a quorum.
Approval of Minutes	The minutes from September 11, 2003 were approved.
	Stuart McKee noted that in the future a section will be included at the top of the minutes to include outstanding items from the previous meeting to assist the Board with tracking issues.
Department of Social and Health Services Investment Plan Approval	Doug Porter, Assistant Secretary of the Medical Assistance Administration, briefed the Board on reasons why a new MMIS system is needed. He explained that the current system actually causes more work for the staff because they are forced to work around the system's limitations.
	There are programs throughout DSHS where payments occur in multiple systems. These systems could be consolidated into one system. The speed of performing transactions in a new MMIS system would save time. A new system would allow providers to go online for the status of their claim, which would cut the call volume by 43 percent. A new system would also eliminate manual interventions, automate changes, allow analysis and provide a comprehensive view of data. The current system was implemented over 20 years ago in 1982.
	John Anderson, MMIS project manager and Gena Crusiani, the MMIS deputy project manager, reviewed the feasibility study with

the Board. They recommended bringing a system in from another state and modifying it to fit Washington's needs.

The plan, if approved by the ISB, will be submitted to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), the federal agency that approves funding for the MMIS. The submission will be submitted on May 1st and the RFP is scheduled for release July 1st. Once the vendor is in place, work will begin January 2005. There will be 24 months for design, development, and implementation and the new MMIS System should be in place in December 2006. Maintenance and phased implementation will take two years, from December 2006 to December 2008.

Motion: The Board moved approval of the Investment Plan as presented. The motion passed.

Office of the Secretary of State's Help America Vote Act (HAVA) status report

Steve Excell from the Office of the Secretary of State (OSOS) introduced John Pearson, the Assistant State Election Director, and Pam Floyd, Manager of Voter Registration Services.

In October 2002 Congress decided that there would be a federal role in the conduct of state and local elections. They offered limited one-time federal funding to upgrade elections technology in the states and counties.

In Washington there are 39 counties with 14 different election management systems (EMS). There are 15 counties that vote by punchcard, 23 counties with optical scan, and one county that had Direct Recording Equipment (DRE), which is a computer with a touchscreen. Over two thirds of the votes cast in Washington are by mail and that includes four vote-by-mail counties. These counties are Pend Oreille, Clallam, Ferry, and Skamania. They have no polling sites except at the County Auditors' offices.

The Help America Vote Act (HAVA) requires states to replace all punchcard-voting systems. A single statewide voter registration database for official registration lists must be established and new procedures for voting at the polls must be developed. Procedures include having a disability access device at each polling site as well as language on provisional voting and identification requirements for people voting for the first time after registering by mail. The state must also develop a complaint process for voters' use.

The total allocation of HAVA was approximately $3.7 billion, to be phased in over a 5-6 year period. Of that amount $3 billion has been appropriated, but not completely distributed. However, states have received $670 million and Washington received its portion of $13.1 million. There is still $2.3 billion that has been

appropriated. Washington's share of this remaining amount is expected to be approximately $60 million.

January 2004 was the initial implementation deadline for HAVA. However after submitting a request for waiver, the new deadline is January 2006.

The Office of Secretary of State has worked with DIS to develop a master contract to get the best overall bulk pricing on certified voting equipment. The master contract will be discretionary, not mandatory.

State Interoperability Executive Committee's status report

Roy Lum, Department of Information Services (DIS) Deputy Director, outlined the committee's recent activities. The committee has prepared an interim communications plan for state public safety first-responders. Key provisions include:

- Selection and use of a common statewide command and control channel, which will effectively enable communications between commanders of different jurisdictions in an emergency.
- Identification of the many existing radio caches that are in use today so that they can be used by first-responders in crisis situations.
- Adoption of a national incident command structure that has recently been implemented by Homeland Security.

Mr. Lum requested, on behalf of SIEC, that Chief Lowell Porter from the State Patrol be approved as the new chairman of SIEC. The SIEC also recommended the appointment of Commissioner Mike Doherty from Clallam County to the committee.

Motion: The Board moved that Commissioner Mike Doherty be appointed to the committee and that Chief Porter preside as Chair of the SIEC. Motion passed.

Department of Corrections' Offender Management Network Information project status report

Joe Lehman, Secretary of the Department of Corrections (DOC) reminded the Board that the risk management identification and the level of service inventory for OMNI was delivered and deployed in March 2003, and was a significant application in Phase 2.

In September 2003 the DOC performed a functional design confirmation process because of the complexity of the modules. They completed the process in November and identified 1676 gaps. They also completed the high-level deployment plan and delivered it to IBM. After discovering the gaps, DOC decided to renegotiate and amend the contract with IBM in December of 2003. The new contract was more detailed and included the critical change requests in the scope of the contract. The

amendment also included the issue of successfully linking the old system with the new system. The requirements work was completed on February 24, 2004.The new contract and amendment extended the delivery date to December 31, 2004.

The original quality assurance consultant left the project, but Copland Company has been contracted to provide the quality assurance for the remainder of the project. The former consultant was thorough and left an inventory of open issues and their status that are currently being worked by DOC and IBM.

The amendment of the contract increased the cost by $3 million, bringing the total IBM contract to $12.5 million. The increase is being funded from existing DOC savings incentive account resources as well as resources originally budgeted for maintenance of the Phase 2 system.

The Board requested that DOC provide a risk management plan that lists the top five risks in the project, and identify triggers for mitigation at the next ISB meeting.

Statewide Information Technology Policy Compliance

Mary Lou Griffith, Senior IT Planning Advisor, DIS, stated that to be fully compliant with ISB standards, every agency must complete and review its IT technology portfolio, security program, and disaster recovery business resumption plan. Agencies are required to submit a compliance letter to the ISB every August.

For 2003, 110 agencies submitted their letter, of which 104 stated they are fully compliant. Since 2002, disaster recovery and portfolio compliance has tripled and security compliance has doubled.

This year there is an additional security policy requirement that requires each agency to have a desk audit from an independent auditor. One hundred eight agencies have completed the audit.

ISB staff received many questions about how to interpret portions of the current version of the IT Security Standards. In response to that feedback, staff is leading a project enlisting members of the Washington Computer Incident Response Center (WACIRC) to help clarify them and add new IT security standards for patch management and remote access.

DIS made a recommendation to the Board to reduce the delegated authority by 25 percent for agencies not in compliance. The Board agreed that they have a strong objective of bringing all agencies into compliance with the IT policy and standards. Furthermore, agencies have had three years to become compliant.

Motion: The Board moved to revoke all delegated authority to any agency that is not fully compliant with IT policy and standards. It authorized the DIS director to reinstate that delegated authority if and when an agency comes into compliance with all IT policy and standards. The Board declared that they are not disallowing any agency to come in front of the Board to make a proposal to move forward with an IT project. Motion passed.

The Board urged the staff to form a team that will help the smaller agencies become compliant as soon as possible.

New Business/Public Comment

Stuart McKee suggested that delegated authority should be an ongoing topic for the Board. He stated that the legislation has changed to include operating infrastructure, data centers, and physical facilities as relevant costs with regard to delegated authority. Discussion should continue in future meetings.

Laura Ruderman expressed concern that agencies may attempt to break up projects into smaller parts in order to get under the delegated authority. She suggested that the Board set standards regarding the definition of a project and the aggregated spending that should be taken into account.

Tom Fitzsimmons requested that the legislative session report and Enterprise Architecture report be submitted to the Board members in written form.

Gary Robinson emphasized the importance of Board members attending the bi-monthly meetings so that ISB business can be completed. He also suggested that they readdress many of the themes that were discussed during the fall planning session.

Emilio Cantu requested that DIS supply a monthly report on major issues with agency projects to update the Board members and keep them apprised of ongoing project status.

The Board agreed that they should attend another planning session, possibly in May.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.